



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1998

No. 148

## House of Representatives

The House met at 1 p.m.  
The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We thank You, O God, for the diversity of our backgrounds and the variety of our experiences, and yet we thank You, too, for the unity of spirit that we can demonstrate one toward another. We are grateful that even as our own ideas show the contrasts in our ways, yet we can display an attitude of understanding and common feeling of respect one to another. We celebrate the beauty of Your whole creation, O God, and we are appreciative that we can come together in the spirit of common cause and shared responsibility. Bless us, O God, this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HEFLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1132, BANDELIER NATIONAL MONUMENT ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENT AND WATERSHED PROTECTION ACT OF 1998 AND S. 2133, PRESERVATION OF THE ROUTE 66 CORRIDOR

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 105-823) on the resolution (H. Res. 604) providing for consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1132) to modify the boundaries of the Bandelier National Monument to include the lands within the headwaters of the Upper Alamo Watershed which drain into the Monument and which are not currently within the jurisdiction of a Federal land management agency, to authorize purchase or donation of those lands, and for other purposes, and for consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2133) to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

### NOTICE

If the 105th Congress adjourns sine die on or before October 20, 1998, a final issue of the Congressional Record for the 105th Congress will be published on October 28, 1998, in order to permit Members to revise and extend their remarks.

All material for insertion must be signed by the Member and delivered to the respective offices of the Official Reporters of Debates (Room HT-60 or S-123 of the Capitol), Monday through Friday, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. through October 27. The final issue will be dated October 28, 1998, and will be delivered on Thursday, October 29.

If the 105th Congress does not adjourn until a later date in 1998, the final issue will be printed at a date to be announced.

None of the material printed in the final issue of the Congressional Record may contain subject matter, or relate to any event that occurred after the sine die date.

Senators' statements should also be submitted electronically, either on a disk to accompany the signed statement, or by e-mail to the Official Reporters of Debates at "Records@Reporters".

Members of the House of Representatives' statements may also be submitted electronically on a disk to accompany the signed statement and delivered to the Official Reporter's office in room HT-60.

Members of Congress desiring to purchase reprints of material submitted for inclusion in the Congressional Record may do so by contacting the Congressional Printing Management Division, at the Government Printing Office, on 512-0224, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. daily.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

JOHN W. WARNER, *Chairman*.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H11025

## FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1999

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 136) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes, and that the House immediately consider and pass the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but I would appreciate if the gentleman under my reservation would explain what the understanding is in terms of the schedule for the consideration of the omnibus appropriation bill, that 77,132-page bill that we are supposed to be bringing up next week.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would be happy to give the gentleman my understanding of the schedule relating to the omnibus bill. Currently we are operating under a fourth continuing resolution which carries us until midnight tonight.

Our expectation is, though, that because we do have a deal between both houses and the White House on the vast bulk of the omnibus bill that it will take some time for our staff to assemble the extensive number of pages which comprise the bill. For that reason, and in order to allow all of the material to be gathered and processed so that we have a bill to be filed, the expectation is that that will take roughly the length of this weekend. The staff will engage in ongoing efforts to make sure that they do their job professionally and well and completely, so that by Monday they will be prepared to allow us to file the bill, we would expect to do that on or about noon of Monday, and it would be available for inspection, and the expectation is then to call Members back on Tuesday afternoon and have a vote on the omnibus bill at about 5 p.m.

So this continuing resolution would carry us through that period of time, make sure that the government does not close, make sure that all of the operations of government continue as they have over the last few weeks since the close of the last fiscal year and that they would continue through midnight Tuesday.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

Continuing under my reservation, Mr. Speaker, I will simply say that is also my understanding. That means that Members should be prepared, as I understand it, to vote on the legislation after 5 p.m. on Tuesday, and they would then be able to get out of town either that evening or the next morning for the duration.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 136

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 106(c) of Public Law 105-240 is further amended by striking "October 16, 1998" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 20, 1998".

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the joint resolution is considered and passed.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will take 15 one-minutes on each side.

## AMERICANS DESTINED TO REAP BENEFITS OF REPUBLICAN-LED CONGRESS

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of the 105th Congress, I believe the American people have a rendezvous with destiny, and that destiny is to regain their freedom from big bureaucracy and big government and go more toward local control.

Four years ago, the Republicans laid the foundation for a balanced Federal budget, real education reform, crime reduction, meaningful tax cuts, a strong military force, welfare reform, and a real commitment to saving Medicare and Social Security.

Four years ago, Republicans charted a path to give Americans a renewed faith in our system of government, in our push to give Americans more control in their lives. Our hardworking families, our children, our men and women who serve in our Nation's armed forces are destined to reap the benefits of a Republican-led Congress that has made a commitment to put an end to wasteful bureaucratic spending, to send Federal education dollars directly to schools and districts and into the classrooms for the benefit of educating children; a commitment to give hard-earned tax dollars back to America's hardworking families; and a commitment to make the strength of our national defense a priority once again.

Mr. Speaker, there is renewed hope for America and I am proud to be a part of this destiny of freedom.

## LITANY OF NONACCOMPLISHMENTS OF A DO-NOTHING CONGRESS

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, let us not kid ourselves. The Republican leadership was not prepared to do anything that was really important or address any of the real issues that the American people cared about in this Congress.

Fortunately, we as Democrats were able to push them as part of this budget agreement to address a few things, most importantly to add 100,000 teachers in the elementary school classes, and also to make sure that the Social Security trust fund was not drained, if you will, for tax giveaways.

But there is a lot more to be done here and this do-nothing Congress, this Republican leadership leading this do-nothing Congress did not address managed care reform, did not address campaign finance reform, did nothing to deal with the severe problem of teenage smoking, did nothing really to deal with most of the education initiatives that the Democrats have put forward. Most importantly, they refused as part of this budget deal to deal with school modernization. We have classrooms, we have schools throughout the country that need repair, that need to be upgraded to deal with computers.

There are a lot of other education initiatives that were not addressed as part of this Congress. I am happy today we just joined with the President, we are happy that they added the 100,000 teachers and that that will be part of this budget deal. We are happy that the Social Security trust fund is still intact, but there is a lot more that needs to be done. Let us not kid ourselves by saying anything that this was nothing but a do-nothing Congress.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,  
OCTOBER 19, 1998

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

## BUDGET BATTLE

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the current budget battle in Washington shows clearly how conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats disagree about the role of government.

Republicans think that the Federal Government is too big. Democrats think that it is not big enough.

Republicans have been pushing for tax cuts. The liberals are horrified at

the very idea and call, as the previous speaker just did, tax cuts giveaways.

Republicans are insisting that we begin to reverse the dangerous decline in our military preparedness. Democrats have been fighting for even less defense.

Republicans blocked a White House attempt to impose national standardized tests in elementary schools. Democrats urged the creation of a national gun registry in their latest effort to weaken second amendment rights.

Republicans stopped the President's big government initiative to create a new handout, free needles for drug addicts. Democrats tried to create a national identity card. Republicans stopped that, too.

Bigger government versus smaller government and more freedom, that is what is at stake. That is what this budget battle has been about over these last few weeks.

#### FAILING MARKS TO REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, for 2 years this Republican Congress has put partisanship ahead of progress. They have consistently kowtowed to special interests. They killed HMO reform, campaign finance reform, tobacco reform, and attempted to raid the Social Security trust fund. In the last few days Democrats have had to fight tooth and nail to reduce America's class sizes by hiring 100,000 teachers. Now Republicans, it is unbelievable to me that they take such pride in the fact that they have prevented school modernization, denying our kids the opportunity to have our schools wired up to the 21st century and that they could take advantage of the technology that will only help them compete in the 21st century.

Let me just say that this Republican Party is out of touch with mainstream America. I am not the only one who thinks so. Jack Kemp, not a well-known Democrat, and I quote: Today the Republican Party is adrift, without an agenda and without purpose beyond its seeming preoccupation with saving the congressional seats of its incumbents.

This Republican Congress has failed the American people.

#### THE SURPLUS CONGRESS: HARDLY A RECORD TO BE SCOFFED AT

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, this Republican Congress that has been so maligned by partisan Democrats has been the first Congress since 1969 to balance the budget. It has been the first Congress to have tax cuts in 16

years. It has been the first Congress to reform and protect Medicare on a bipartisan basis. And the first Congress to have welfare reform and 40 percent of the people who were on welfare in 1994 are now independent, working. This is hardly a record to be scoffed at.

What have we done this year? We have protected Social Security. We have stopped the Democrat practice of taking the surplus out of Social Security and spending it on roads and bridges. We have protected the family farm with the farm disaster bill. We have protected education by giving more power to local school boards and less from Washington bureaucracy. And we are on the verge of passing major drug legislation that will give strong interdiction, strong prevention and rehabilitation services. We think this is a solid legacy.

This Congress will be remembered as the surplus Congress. I am proud that I played a part of it.

□ 1315

#### A DO-NOTHING CONGRESS? SIMPLY NOT TRUE

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rarely come to these also 1-minutes, but I could not maintain silence after what I have been hearing they say. They say we are a do-nothing Congress, we are not concerned about the average Joe or Jane.

Capital gains tax reduction. The increase of the estate tax exemption threshold, which means that the tax man will be delayed when he comes a calling after someone has lost a loved one. Welfare reform. IRS reform. Balanced Budget Amendment.

Now does anyone in range of my voice believe that either of these five could have been done without a Republican majority in the people's House? Obviously not because it has not been done before.

I keep hearing my friends to my right, to my ideological left, claiming about campaign finance reform, nothing has been done about it. Well, Mr. Speaker, they were in control of the People's House for 40 years, and nothing was done about it.

I am very much offended, Mr. Speaker, by people who come to the well of this House and point an accusatory finger and accuse this 105th Congress of doing nothing. It is simply not true.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district during Rollcall Votes 532 through 535. Had I been present I would have voted yes on Rollcalls 532 and 533, and no on Rollcall 534, and no on Rollcall 535.

#### ANOTHER BILLION DOLLARS FOR THE STAR WARS FANTASY

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, Congress would have adjourned one week ago after only 108 days work without an additional penny for public education, but the President held the Republican majority's feet to the fire, and so now, a week later, we have got \$1.2 billion, new money for smaller class size; \$871 million has been replaced for the Summer Jobs for Youth Program that they wanted to kill; \$250 million for Youth Opportunities, and \$160 million add-on to Head Start. This is a victory for Democratic priorities.

But unfortunately this gargantuan 4000-page budget bill further reflects the difference in the budget priorities of the Republicans and the Democrats. The Republicans in this are going to add \$9.1 billion to an already bloated Pentagon budget, another \$1 billion into the Star Wars fantasy where we have already dumped 50 billion with no results. Not a penny, not a penny here on earth, to help rebuild or build new schools, but another billion dollars for the Star Wars fantasy. That is a sad commentary on their priorities.

#### PROUD OF THE 105TH

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, it is a time of year when we do our retrospectives on what this Congress has accomplished, and we have heard some comments about that already. We have cut taxes for the first time in 16 years; we have balanced the budget for the first time since 1969. Even better than that, we have achieved a surplus, and when I was first elected 5 years ago, we had nearly a \$300 billion deficit in this Congress and for this Nation; today, approximately \$85 billion surplus.

How does that affect us as citizens and legislators of this country? Just an example:

My daughter and her husband are in the process of buying their first house. The interest rates are the lowest they have been in this Nation in many, many years. That is related to our budget surplus because the government is not in the market borrowing an additional \$300 billion, but they are pumping \$85 billion back in, and that reduces interest rates.

Much else has happened in this Congress. I participated in developing the first science policy statement that this Congress has adopted in many years, and that is going to have a real impact on the science and technology and will certainly make our Nation more competitive among all.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a good Congress, and I am proud to have been part of it.

# HAPPY TO HAVE BEEN A PART OF THE 105TH

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard this morning that this was a quote, unquote, do-nothing Congress. I think the liberals think that because nothing has happened for the left. I think they must have been hiding under their desk. They did start out wanting to spend 150 billion more dollars on new government programs. They wanted to raise taxes by \$130 billion, but we did not let that happen. We did balance the federal budget, we do have a \$70 billion surplus, we have been able to strengthen families, strengthen their pocketbooks through lower interest rates. We have been able to strengthen our military. Right now we cannot conduct a similar scenario like the Gulf War, but we are going to strengthen the military. We also provided the first steps for strengthening Social Security and Medicare.

Now the left can claim they got 100,000 new teachers, but nobody over there has done the math. If they figure out the math, they only got \$10,000 per teacher. Who is going to make up the difference? Can they find a teacher who will work for \$10,000 a year?

Well, Republicans have a good program for saving schools, for making them stronger by getting parents involved. We have done that this year in the 105th Congress. It has been a good Congress, a successful Congress, and I am happy to be a part of it.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Tuesday, October 20, 1998.

## PLANT PATENT AMENDMENTS ACTS OF 1997

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1197) to amend title 35, United States Code, to protect patent owners against the unauthorized sale of plant parts taken from plants illegally reproduced, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Page 4, after line 14 insert:

### SEC. 4. ACCESS TO ELECTRONIC PATENT INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States Patent and Trademark Office shall develop and implement statewide computer networks with remote library sites in requesting rural

States such that citizens in those States will have enhanced access to information in their State's patent and trademark depository library.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "rural States" means the States that qualified on January 1, 1997, as rural States under section 1501(b) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 379bb(b)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial measure that will serve as a needed compliment to current plant patent law which we passed under suspension of the rules on October 9 of this year. The other body has also amended the bill by adding a provision that will enable small inventors living in rural areas greater access to patent information.

The first provision of H.R. 1197 amends current law governing plant patent parts. Since 1930 the Patent Act has permitted inventors to obtain plant patents. Individuals wishing to skirt protections available under the law have discovered a loophole, however, by trading in plant parts taken from illegally produced plants. H.R. 1197 closes this loophole by explicitly protecting plant parts to the same extent as plants under the Patent Act.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical to language that was contained in the omnibus patent legislation which passed earlier in the term. There is no opposition to the bill as it will benefit American patentholders and the plant producers as well who honor their work by paying the necessary royalties.

The second provision of the bill simply authorizes the Patent and Trademark Office to develop and implement statewide computer networks with remote library sites, thereby enabling small inventors to have greater access to information in patent and trademark depository libraries.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment that was done in the other body makes a good bill even better, and I think it will benefit our nation's inventors, Mr. Speaker, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I use this excuse to support the bill to commend my sub-

committee chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for a year's worth of very good cooperation, a Congress worth of very good cooperation. He is unique, and we have been able to work through many problems that have actually confounded the Committee on the Judiciary for more than a year or two, and this has been a successful relationship between those Members, the subcommittee members and the Members on my side.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the plant patent bill, commend our colleague, ranking colleague from Vermont on the other side, Senator PAT LEAHY, and I urge that we support the provisions here that correct a loophole that has arisen as some people have sought to trade in plants; that is in the environmental sense plant parts taken from illegally produced plants, and we specifically are protecting these additional plants as well, and I commend the members of the Committee on the Judiciary for working so well together on this measure.

I rise in strong support of this little noticed, but important change to our patent laws.

This legislation protects plant parts to the same extent as plants themselves are protected under the Patent Act. The holders of plant patents, the same as an other American who develops a patent and follows the rules, are entitled to protection.

As Mr. COBLE has noted, a loophole in the plant patent area has arisen in recent years as some individuals have sought to trade in plant parts taken from illegally produced plants. This legislation closes this loophole by specifically protecting the plant parts. This language is identical to language from the omnibus patent bill which passed the House earlier this session.

The legislation before us also includes a provision which authorizes the Patent and Trademark Office to develop and implement statewide computer networks with remote library sites. This will allow small inventors in rural areas to have greater access to patent and trademark information.

While I have some time remaining, I would like to congratulate my good friend the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, for the excellent work he has done as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property. In recent weeks he has succeeded in passing a number of landmark intellectual property bills, including copyright extension and implementation of the World Intellectual Property Organization Treaties. Thanks to Mr. COBLE's stewardship, our creators and inventors can rest assured that they will receive fair compensation for their work. Because of the rush of business at the end of the calendar, other important measures relating to data base protection and patent reform were not completed, but we will continue to push these measures on a bipartisan basis next Congress.

I would also like to thank Chairman COBLE for his hard work on important franchise legislation that he and I introduced 2 days ago. I look forward to working with him on this matter of vital importance to so many small businesses early on in the next Congress.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also have no speakers, but I wanted to express my thanks to the gentleman from Michigan for his generous comments, and at the risk of sounding immodest, I agree. I think our subcommittee has accomplished a lot of good this year with the help of both sides of the aisle, including my friend from Michigan, and I thank him for his comments. And I would be remiss if I did not also mention Senator PATRICK LEAHY who has already been mentioned and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) who chairs the House Agriculture Committee and has been very actively involved in this process as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1197.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I seek to correct the RECORD. On Rollcall Vote 428, which was on House Concurrent Resolution 254, I was recorded being in favor of the measure, and I would like the RECORD to reflect that I should have been recorded as being opposed to the measure.

#### MONEY LAUNDERING AND FINANCIAL CRIMES STRATEGY ACT OF 1998

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1756) to amend chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, to require the development and implementation by the Secretary of the Treasury of a national money laundering and related financial crime strategy to combat money laundering and related financial crimes, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Page 2, strike out all after line 20, over to and including line 3 on age 3 and insert:

"(2) MONEY LAUNDERING AND RELATED FINANCIAL CRIME.—The term 'money laundering and related financial crime'—

"(A) means the movement of illicit cash or cash equivalent proceeds into, out of, or through the United States, or into, out of, or through United States financial institutions, as defined in section 5312 of title 31, United States Code; or

"(B) has the meaning given that term (or the term used for an equivalent offense) under State and local criminal statutes pertaining to the movement of illicit cash or cash equivalent proceeds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1756.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

□ 1330

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1756 is the Money Laundering and Financial Crimes Strategy Act of 1998. It was introduced by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and myself, and it directs the Secretary of the Treasury to create a national strategy for combating money laundering and other financial crimes by coordinating money laundering and other financial crimes. It also supplies resources to Federal, state and local agencies in the coordination of their efforts.

I would explain to Members what is so important about money laundering. Money laundering is the flip side of narcotics trafficking. When we talk about the war on drugs, when we talk about our efforts against drugs, some people do not realize that it is a two-way street. On the TV we observe pictures of large amounts of drugs being seized, of drugs being destroyed, of them being intercepted, and, in fact, we have been very successful in seizing a great percentage of the drugs coming into this Nation.

Where we have failed, where we have not addressed the problem that needs to be addressed, is in money laundering. When drugs are sold, for them to be profitable to the money launderers and the drug cartels overseas, they not only have to sell their product, they have to reap their profit. That means that the money must flow back out of the country. They must get the money back out.

In fact, law enforcement agencies and policy makers tell us that if you want to hit the drug cartels where it hurts the worst, you do not seize the drugs, because there is an endless supply of that; you seize the money. And that is what this new strategy is about. Unfortunately, we estimate we are seizing less than 1 percent of drug proceeds money, and, therefore, this legislation I think is going to be a hallmark and really a nail in hopefully the coffin of drug cartels overseas which are preying on our young men and women on the streets of America.

The legislation provides for the designation of high risk money laundering areas for the purpose of providing those localities with increased Federal atten-

tion and funding for state and local law enforcement efforts.

We had a pilot project in New York City in the district of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), who, I am sure, will cover this in more detail. But to tell you about the gravity of this situation, this effort was headed up by the New York police, the city police, New York State police, Customs. In a short period of time, over \$1 billion of money transfers to Colombia were intercepted during this effort. I am not talking about \$1 million, I am not talking about tens of millions of dollars. Over \$1 billion in transfers were intercepted. So that gives you some idea about the magnitude of this problem.

Now, the House passed this measure earlier this month by voice vote. On Wednesday, the Senate passed it with an amendment, again by unanimous consent. The Senate amendment is relatively modest in scope. I think it improves the bill, and I have been asked by Members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Commerce to explain that amendment for the record.

As passed by the House, this act provided that the Secretary of the Treasury's authority to develop a national strategy for combating money laundering and related crimes extended to all potential violations of title 18, sections 1956 and 1957. Those sections are the basic criminal money laundering provisions of our Federal law, and they contain more than 100 predicate offenses involving crimes as varied or desperate as obscenity and arms control export violations.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation raised concerns that the sheer breadth of the criminal conduct covered by these two sections, 1956 and 1957, might complicate the Treasury Department's ability to develop a coherent national strategy for combating money laundering and in allocating scarce law enforcement resources to initiatives undertaken at the state and local level.

In response to that, we in the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), requested and the Senate conceded and actually offered an amendment, and also the Senate was very supportive of this amendment and amended the bill to provide that the national strategy should be directed at the movement of illicit cash or cash equivalent proceeds into, out of and through the United States, or into, out of and through United States financial institutions, because many of these are electronic transfers, rather than directing the scope to the more broad offenses delineated in title 18 and other portions of the U.S. Code. We all agree this is a good amendment that strengthens the bill.

I also want to, at the request of the Committee on Commerce, take this opportunity to clarify the legislative intent behind another provision of H.R. 1756, and that is section 2.

Section 2 amends chapter 53 of title 31 of the U.S. Code to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to regularly review enforcement efforts under the chapter and under the subchapter and other provisions of the law, and, when appropriate, modify existing regulations or prescribe new regulations for the purposes of preventing money laundering and related financial crimes.

On June 25, 1998, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) wrote to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and myself, to express concern that such a broad mandate could be interpreted to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to review enforcement actions under the Federal securities laws or to modify regulations promulgated pursuant to Federal securities laws or to grant the Secretary of Treasury new or additional authority to prescribe regulations applicable to entities that are regulated pursuant to the Federal securities law.

In response, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) affirmed that it is not the Committee on Banking and Financial Services's intent for the language in section 2 to grant the Secretary of Treasury any new or additional authority over entities that are regulated pursuant to the Federal securities law or to require or encourage the Secretary of the Treasury to review enforcement actions under the Federal securities law, or to modify or recommend the modification of regulations promulgated under the Federal securities laws. That response has been accepted.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to emphasize that H.R. 1756 is an excellent example of the spirit of bipartisanship and comity that has historically characterized the Committee on Banking and Financial Services's deliberation on anti-money laundering initiatives.

We do hear a lot of partisanship and wrangling in this body. That is not always the case. In bringing this bill before both the House and the Senate, Democrats and Republicans have joined together, they worked closely with the administration, and the result has been a nonpartisan or bipartisan effort, which we believe will go a long way in combating illegal drugs and money laundering.

The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) should be particularly commended for her work, and by this I mean her hard work on this matter. She has been a big help in dealing with the law enforcement agencies.

In addition, I would like to commend and give special recognition to the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH) and to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) for their efforts in moving this important bill through the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Also I want to commend members of the Subcommittee on General Over-

sight and Investigations staff for their hard work on money laundering in this Congress.

An example of the administration and the Congress working together on this bill is that Dave Cohen from my staff, who basically worked with Ms. VELÁZQUEZ on a daily basis in the particulars of this bill, as a result of working with Customs, he is no longer with the subcommittee. He was in fact hired by Customs, which sort of pays us a compliment to his ability. Dave, within the last month, has taken the position as assistant to the Commissioner, Ray Kelly, at Customs. So I think that ought to be a compliment to the entire Congress and to the staff that worked on this bill.

In addition, I would like to compliment the legal staff that worked on this bill. Jim Clinger, the Clinger name is a name that most of us in Congress recognize. His father, Bill Clinger, served in this body with distinction. Jim Clinger and Win Yerby, legal counsel for the majority, worked closely on this bill. I am particularly pleased that Win Yerby is a native Alabamian.

On the democratic side, Rick Maurano, who is seated at the table with Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, also did yeoman's work on this bill. Again, this was a totally nonpartisan effort.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, I will say in closing that I have had six money laundering hearings. In fact, money laundering has been the central focus of the subcommittee's work, because I see it as one of the most important responsibilities of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations. The reason I do is because the threat that narcotic drugs has in every community, in every state, in every locality, to us, to the integrity of our law enforcement agencies, and to the safety and welfare of our citizens.

As I said, again, thanks to the gentlewoman from New York, this bill will go a long way in hitting the drug cartels where it hurts the worst, in the pocketbook.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1756, the Money Laundering and Financial Crimes Strategy Act of 1998, introduced by the gentlelady from New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Chairman LEACH, Representative GONZALEZ, and myself, directs the Secretary of the Treasury to create a national strategy for combating money laundering and other financial crimes by coordinating Federal State, and local efforts and resources. The legislation provides for the designation of high risk money laundering areas for the purpose of providing these localities with increased Federal attention and funding for State and local law enforcement efforts.

The House passed this measure earlier this month by voice vote, and on Wednesday, the other body passed it with an amendment by unanimous consent. The Senate amendment is relatively modest in scope.

As passed by the House, H.R. 1756 provided that the Secretary of the Treasury's authority to develop a national strategy for com-

bating "money laundering and related crimes" extended to all potential violations of 18 U.S.C. sections 1956 and 1957, the basic criminal money laundering provisions, which themselves contain more than 100 predicate offenses involving crimes as disparate as obscenity and arms control export violations. After the Federal Bureau of Investigation raised concerns that the sheer breadth of criminal conduct covered by sections 1956 and 1957 might complicate the Treasury Department's ability to develop a coherent national strategy for combating money laundering and to allocate scarce law enforcement resources to initiatives undertaken at the State and local levels, the Senate amended the bill to provide that the national strategy should be directed at the "movement of illicit cash or cash equivalent proceeds into, out of or through the United States, or into, out of or through United States financial institutions," rather than at the specific underlying offenses delineated in title 18 and other portions of the United States Code.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take this opportunity to clarify the legislative intent behind another provision of H.R. 1756. Section 2 of the legislation amends chapter 53 of title 31 of the United States Code to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to "regularly review enforcement efforts under this subchapter and other provisions of laws and, when appropriate, modify existing regulations or prescribe new regulations for purposes of preventing" money laundering and related financial crimes. On June 25, 1998, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Mr. BLILEY, wrote to Chairman LEACH to express the concern that "such a broad mandate could be interpreted to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to review enforcement actions under the Federal securities laws or to modify regulations promulgated pursuant to the Federal securities laws, or to grant the Secretary of the Treasury new or additional authority to prescribe regulations applicable to entities that are regulated pursuant to the Federal securities laws."

In response, Chairman LEACH affirmed that it is not the Banking Committee's intent for the language in section 2 to grant the Secretary of the Treasury any new or additional authority over entities that are regulated pursuant to the Federal securities laws, or to require or encourage the Secretary of the Treasury to review enforcement actions under the Federal securities laws or to modify, or recommend the modification of, regulations promulgated under the Federal securities laws.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize that H.R. 1756 is an excellent example of the spirit of bipartisanship and comity that has historically characterized the Banking Committee's deliberations on antimoney laundering initiatives. The gentlewoman from New York Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, should be particularly commended for her hard work on this matter. Special recognition should also be accorded to Chairman LEACH and to the ranking minority member, Mr. LAFALCE for their efforts in moving this important bill through the Banking Committee. I also want to commend members of the Banking Oversight Subcommittee for their hard work on money laundering in this Congress. As chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee, I have made money laundering a central focus of the subcommittee's work because I see it as one of the most important responsibilities of the Banking and Financial Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by again thanking the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for all their work on this legislation. Also I would like to recognize the work that for the last four years my legislative director, Catherine Cruz Wojtasik, has been doing on this legislation.

This bill proves that crime fighting is a bipartisan issue. Today's Money Laundering and Financial Crimes Strategy Act is the same anti-money laundering legislation that passed the House last week. Technical changes were made by the Senate that will broaden the definition of money laundering. These changes are endorsed by the Treasury Department, the Justice Department, the FBI and the local district attorneys in New York City.

In the expanded definition we allow Federal, state and local law enforcement officials to keep up with the changing trends in money laundering. It will provide police officers and prosecutors with the tools that they need to effectively combat large and sophisticated crime syndicates.

The Money Laundering and Financial Crimes Strategy Act is an important step in helping communities fight drug traffickers that launder money in their neighborhood. I urge all Members to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in conclusion that Catherine Cruz Wojtasik did work very hard on this bill. I think it shows that the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) has assembled a good staff, and I would like to commend Ms. Cruz Wojtasik on her work on the bill.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, I apologize for that oversight.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1756.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BUDGET AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTS COMMONSENSE CONSERVATIVE VALUES

(Mr. TALENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the recently concluded budget agreement. In fact, the more I look at that budget agreement, the more I like it.

It begins to implement the Dollars to the Classroom principle, whereby we defund Federal bureaucracies and empower parents and teachers. It provides that with the Census, we are going to count people. We are not going to guess how many people are in the United States. It says we are going to stop child porn on the Internet.

We are going to reinvigorate the war on drugs. We are going to spend \$9.5 billion on the national defense, money that is vital to America's greatness. We are going to have the first ever IMF reforms, and all this on top of a balanced budget with a surplus, tax relief, and welfare reform.

It is an implementation of common-sense conservative values, Mr. Speaker. It looks like we are going to have support from the other side of the aisle. I hope we come back here as soon as possible and pass it.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEACH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CONGRATULATING JOHN HUME, A WINNER OF THE NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to take this time to note that the Nobel Prize for peace today was given to two Irish heroes named David Trimble and John Hume. I do not know Mr. Trimble, who is the leader of the Protestant groups in Northern Ireland seeking peace, but I do know John Hume. I have known him for a good many years, and I think that his selection today was an absolutely perfect choice.

John Hume is a person who, as a very young man, began to peacefully protest the fact that there was a systematic policy to deny employment to Catholic males in Northern Ireland. He began to lead peaceful marches out of the Catholic neighborhoods to try to peace-

fully protest that fact, in the spirit of Martin Luther King.

The Protestant forces reacted violently. He was beaten a number of times. At one point he laid down in front of a tank with his wife standing just a few feet away. She thought he was a dead man. Fortunately, the tank stopped.

He also experienced violence at the hands of Catholic forces in Northern Ireland, because he was insisting that whatever actions taken by Catholic forces be peaceful, so his reward was that they tried to assassinate him many times. His home was firebombed at least once, I believe twice, once with his family in it.

He even had the experience of being at a country roadside, at a stop sign, when a car plowed into him from behind at a high rate of speed. The car exploded. He walked out of the car without a scratch, and a week later collapsed from post-trauma stress reaction, with his heart in fibrillation, and almost died.

Today he has been one of, if not the leading voice in all of Ireland for peace, and he has been instrumental in bringing the IRA together in peace talks with their Protestant counterparts. I think it is safe to say that there would be no peace process in Ireland, were it not for John Hume.

I simply want to take this time to note on this side of the Atlantic that a true hero of our age has been nominated or has been named the recipient of the Nobel Prize for peace today, along with Mr. Trimble, who also has been heroic in trying to lead the Protestant forces in Northern Ireland to a peaceful resolution of their differences.

In all of the years of public life, I have never met a person as inspiring as John Hume. I have never met a person who has been willing to undergo more physical violence to his own person than John Hume, except perhaps for our colleague in this Chamber, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHN LEWIS).

It just seems to me that we should today take note of the fact that the Nobel committee made a superb choice. I congratulate John Hume, I congratulate his wife, Pat, who has been with him every inch of the way in helping him through a lifetime of work for peace.

If I were asked to name a single person in the Western World who epitomizes what Christian values are supposed to be, I would say that John Hume is that person. I was thrilled to see that he was one of the two winners of that Nobel Prize today.

#### ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK WILDERNESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) is recognized for five minutes.



Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Rocky Mountain National Park Wilderness Act of 1998. This legislation will provide important protection and management direction for some truly remarkable country, adding nearly 250,000 acres in the park to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

The bill is a revised version of one I introduced last year and similar measures I proposed in the 103rd and 104th Congresses. It also reflects previous proposals by former Senator Bill Armstrong and others.

Over the last several years, I've worked with the National Park Service and others to refine the boundaries of the areas proposed for wilderness designation. I've also consulted closely with many interested parties in Colorado, including local officials and both the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District and the St. Vrain & Left Hand Ditch Water Conservancy District. These consultations have provided the basis for many of the new bill's provisions, particularly regarding the status of existing water facilities.

I had hoped that the consultations would result in a consensus that would make it possible to enact a Rocky Mountain National Park wilderness bill this year. Regrettably, complete consensus has not yet been achieved, and there's no longer sufficient time for action to be completed during this session. But I think it's important to introduce this bill today in order to provide a benchmark of the progress already made and to lay the foundation for what I hope will be a successful effort by others to complete the job in the new Congress that convenes next year.

Covering 94 percent of the park, the new wilderness will include Longs Peaks and other major mountains along the Great Continental Divide, glacial cirques and snow fields, broad expanses of alpine tundra and wet meadows, old-growth forests, and hundreds of lakes and streams, all untrammelled by human structures or passage. Indeed, examples of all the natural ecosystems that make up the splendor of Rocky Mountain National Park are included in this wilderness designation.

The features of these lands and waters that make Rocky Mountain National Park a true gem in our national parks system also make it an outstanding wilderness candidate.

As I mentioned, this new bill includes more precise wilderness boundaries and acreage numbers, greatly simplified water rights language, and provisions to confirm the continued operation of important water delivery systems located in, under, and near the park—including the Grand River Ditch, Long Draw Reservoir, Copeland Reservoir, and the portals of the Adams Tunnel, a key component of the Colorado-Big Thompson water project.

The wilderness boundaries are carefully located to also assure continued access for use of existing roadways, buildings and developed areas, privately owned land, and areas where additional facilities and roadwork will improve park management and visitor services.

This bill is based on National Park Service recommendations, prepared 24 years ago and presented to Congress by President Nixon. It seems to me that, in that time, we have sufficiently studied, considered, and refined those recommendations so that Congress can proceed with this legislation. I believe that this bill constitutes a fair and complete proposal, sufficiently providing for the legitimate needs of the public at large and all interested groups, and deserves to be enacted in this form.

It took more than a decade before we in the Colorado delegation were finally able, in 1993, to designate additional wilderness in our state's national forests. Soon, the potentially more complex question of wilderness designations of lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management must be addressed. Meanwhile, the time is ripe for finally resolving the status of the lands within Rocky Mountain National Park that are dealt with in this bill.

We all know that water rights are often a primary point of contention in the congressional debate over designating wilderness areas. The question of water rights for Rocky Mountain National Park wilderness is entirely different from many considered before, and is far simpler.

To begin with, it has long been recognized under the law of the United States and Colorado, including a decision of the Colorado Supreme Court, that Rocky Mountain National Park already has extensive federal reserved water rights arising from the creation of the national park itself.

Division One of the Colorado Water Court, which has jurisdiction over the portion of the park that is east of the continental divide, has already decided how extensive the water rights are in its portion of the park. In December, 1993, the court ruled that the park has reserved rights to all water within the park that was unappropriated at the time the park was created. As a result of this decision, in the eastern half of the park there literally is no more water for either the park or anybody else to claim. This is not, so far as I have been able to find out, a controversial decision, because there is a widespread consensus that there should be no new water projects developed within Rocky Mountain National Park. And, since the park sits astride the continental divide, there's no higher land around from which streams flow in the park, so there is no possibility of any upstream diversions.

As for the western side of the park, the water court has not yet ruled on the extent of the park's existing water rights there, although it has affirmed that the park does have rights. With all other rights to water arising in the park and flowing west already claimed, as a practical matter under Colorado water law, this designation will not restrict any new water claims.

And it's important to emphasize that any wilderness water rights amount only to guarantees that water will continue to flow through and out of the park as it always has. This preserves the natural environment of the park, but it doesn't affect downstream water use. Once water leaves the park, it will continue to be available for diversion and use under Colorado law.

These legal and practical realities are reflected in the new bill by inclusion of a finding that the park already has reserved rights to substantial amounts of water, so that there is no need for any additional reservation of such right, and an explicit disclaimer that the bill effects any such reservation. The bill also includes language to confirm that its enactment will not adversely affect any existing water facilities.

Why should we designate wilderness in a national park? Isn't park protection the same as wilderness, or at least as good?

The wilderness designation will give an important additional level of protection to most of the park. Our national park system was cre-

ated, in part, to recognize and preserve prime examples of outstanding landscape. At Rocky Mountain National Park in particular, good Park Service management over the past 83 years has kept most of the park in a natural condition. And all the lands that are covered by this bill are currently being managed, in essence, to protect their wilderness character. Formal wilderness designation will no longer leave this question to the discretion of the Park Service, but will make it clear that within the designated areas there will never be roads, visitor facilities, or other manmade features that interfere with the spectacular natural beauty and wildness of the mountains.

This kind of protection is especially important for a park like Rocky Mountain, which is relatively small by western standards. As surrounding land development and alteration has accelerated in recent years, the pristine nature of the park's backcountry becomes an increasingly rare feature of Colorado's landscape.

Further, Rocky Mountain National Park's popularity demands definitive and permanent protection for wild areas against possible pressures for development within the park. While only about one tenth the size of Yellowstone National Park, Rocky Mountain sees nearly the same number of visitors each year as does our first national park.

On the other hand, Congress' decision to designate these carefully selected portions of Rocky Mountain as wilderness will make other areas, now restricted under interim wilderness protection management, available for overdue improvements to park roads and visitor facilities.

This bill will protect some of our nation's finest wild lands. It will protect existing rights. It will not limit any existing opportunity for new water development. And it will affirm our commitment in Colorado to preserving the very features that make our State such a remarkable place to live.

I am attaching a fact sheet giving more details about the bill.

#### ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK WILDERNESS ACT OF 1998

##### WILDERNESS BOUNDARIES

The bill will designate the Rocky Mountain National Park Wilderness, which will include 94% of the park. The bill is based on the recommendations of President Nixon, with some revisions in boundaries to reflect acquisitions and other changes since that recommendation was submitted. The National Park Service has been managing lands recommended for wilderness in accordance with that recommendation, so the bill's enactment won't significantly change the management of the park.

The bill designates about 249,562 acres of new wilderness. In addition, about 1,125 acres would be designated as potential wilderness, to be managed as wilderness, when non-conforming uses end.

There are currently about 2,917 acres of wilderness (in the Indian Peaks area), that were included in the park in 1980 by Public Law 96-560; prior to that, they were part of the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests and were designated as wilderness in 1978 by Public Law 95-450.

The wilderness designated by the new bill is in four separate sections:

Mummy Range Unit, the northernmost section of wilderness, approximately 84,006 acres north of Fall River Road and east of



the Grand River ditch, includes large areas of alpine, sub-alpine-forest, wet-meadow, and montane-forest ecosystems. Dominant features are the Mummy Range and Specimen Mountain. This portion extends to park's north boundary, adjoining existing Comanche Peak Wilderness on the Roosevelt National Forest.

Trail Ridge Unit, a relatively small section of the wilderness, lies between Fall River Road and Trail Ridge Road, and includes approximately 6,310 acres. This section includes forested mountainside of lodgepole pine, Englemann spruce and sub-alpine fir, and the park's trademark expanse of alpine tundra and sub-alpine forest.

Never Summer Unit, another fairly small section west of the Grand River Ditch, which comprises approximately 9,824 acres, is generally above timberline, featuring steep slopes and peaks of the Never Summer Mountains, including 12 peaks reaching 12,000 feet in elevation. This area adjoins the existing Neota Wilderness on the Roosevelt National Forest and Never Summer Wilderness on the Routt National Forest.

Enos Mills Unit, the largest portion of the wilderness—approximately 149,408 acres—is south of Trail Ridge Road and generally bounded on the east, south, and west by the park boundary. This area contains examples of every ecosystem present in the park. The park's dramatic stretch of the Continental Divide, featuring Longs Peak (elevation 14,251 feet) and other peaks over 13,000 feet, dominate.

Former reservoir sites at Blue Bird, Sand Beach, and Pear lakes, previously breached and reclaimed, are included in wilderness as is a portion of the Indian Peaks Wilderness transferred to the park in 1980, when the boundary between the park and the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest was adjusted.

The bill also includes language to provide that if non-federal inholdings within the wilderness boundaries are acquired by the United States, they will become part of the wilderness and managed accordingly and that specified federal lands within the park will be managed as wilderness when current incompatible uses cease.

#### AREAS EXCLUDED FROM WILDERNESS DESIGNATION

The following areas are not included in the bill's wilderness designation:

Trail Ridge and other roads used for motorized travel; water storage and conveyance structures; buildings; and other developed areas are not included in wilderness.

Parcels of privately owned land or land subject to life estate agreements in the park.

Water diversion structures (see below).

#### WATER

The new bill would NOT create a new federal reserved water right. Instead, it includes a finding that the park's existing federal reserved rights, as decided by the Colorado courts, are adequate and an explicit statement that the bill does not create any new federal reserved water right.

#### EXISTING WATER FACILITIES

Boundaries for the wilderness designated in the bill are drawn to exclude (among other things): existing water storage and water conveyance structures, assuring continued use of Grand River Ditch and its right-of-way; the east and west portals of the Adams Tunnel of the Colorado-Big Thompson Project (CBT); CBT gauging stations; Long Draw Reservoir; and lands owned by the St. Vrain & Left Hand Water Conservancy District, including Copeland Reservoir.

The bill includes provisions to make clear that its enactment will not impose new restrictions on already-allowed activities for the operation, maintenance, repair, or recon-

struction of the Adams Tunnel, which diverts water under Rocky Mountain National Park (including lands that would be designated as wilderness by the bill) or other CBT facilities, and that additional activities for these purposes will be allowed, should they be necessary to respond to emergencies.

#### A REPUBLICAN SURPLUS CONGRESS BRINGS GREAT BENEFITS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, it is the nature of politics that we never get everything we want. But when the American people support a general direction in which we want to go, small victories do become possible.

Yesterday's agreement between Congress and the White House on the remaining spending bills represent a victory for those seeking to take this country in the direction that the Republicans have been trying to go, the direction of smaller government, holding the line on spending, local control of education, tax relief, a stronger military, and more weapons for the war on drugs.

After many months of difficult negotiations, an agreement has been reached that reflects the priorities of a Republican Congress. This Congress can properly be called the surplus Congress. Just a short time ago, Congress was facing \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye could see. Anyone proposing to end that was immediately labeled as an extremist by liberal Members on the other side of the aisle.

Here we are, with a Federal budget that has a surplus at hand. Now, I know that there are a number of Democrats who fervently believe that the current budget surplus is due to President Clinton's 1993 tax increase, but they are wrong.

Federal revenues are up, way up, but I would suggest to my friends on the other side to examine the budget tables and take a look at where those revenues are coming from. I am fairly confident that they have not done that, because if they had, they would discover that strong job growth and the booming stock market are primarily responsible for those increased revenues, and not the Clinton tax hike.

The funny thing is that no matter how many times this is pointed out, the liberals continue to go on thinking that it was a tax hike, Clinton's tax hike, that put us on the right track, out of budget deficits. Not to belabor the point, but it is important to know the truth about this very important issue.

To those on the other side who are still not convinced, despite the fact that the budget tables are available for the whole world to see, they only need to consider the President's own budget a mere 2 years ago. In the 1996 budget, 3 years after the Clinton tax hike, it contained \$200 billion-a-year budget

deficits as far as the eye could see past the end of this century, into the next century.

It was not until a Republican Congress forced the President to accept a balanced budget that the surplus actually became a reality. The deficit Congress was transformed into a surplus Congress.

The primary reason why a balanced budget benefits the average person is because it makes lower interest rates. That means it is easier to buy a house and to make monthly mortgage payments. It means those credit card debts are a little easier to pay off. It means that young people who want to go on and further their education have an easier time paying off student loans. Most important of all, lower interest rates mean business can expand more easily and create new jobs, and job creation, economic growth, means higher revenues.

Mr. Speaker, this shows that the cuts on the capital gains taxes were important in a couple of ways. Federal revenues from capital gains realizations are way up, and low taxes on capital investments mean more capital invested.

Ronald Reagan cut the taxes on capital gains. This Republican Congress did it again. The results are that capital investments have soared, and liberals on left are scratching their heads, wondering why the economy is booming. It is not rocket science and it is not magic. The Republicans were elected in 1994 to change the course after 40 years of Democrat rule; 40 years in the direction of bigger government, higher taxes, and less accountability.

As we approach the final actions of this surplus Congress, I am glad that we have held fast to Republican principles of limited growth in the Federal Government, of tax relief, stronger schools, safer streets, a better military, a balanced budget, and a \$70 billion Federal surplus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TOWNS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EHLERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF  
MEMBER OF CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE  
OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Kay Ford, Associate Administrator of the Office of Human Resources of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE  
OFFICER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, October 14, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that the Office of the Chief Administrator has been served with a subpoena issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule L (50).

Sincerely,

KAY FORD,  
Associate Administrator, Office  
of Human Resources.

THE BUDGET AGREEMENT AND  
THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE  
105TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the budget agreement and the achievements of this Congress. This is probably the next to the last day that we will be in session, and it seems to me appropriate to look back, not just over the last 2 years, but over the last 4 years, because this is sort of the end of phase two of what has been a very dramatic change in policy.

Four years ago, for the first time in 40 years, since 1954, the American people asked a Republican leadership to take over the Congress. We came with a set of goals. We had campaigned on a Contract With America, where we said that we would balance the budget, reform welfare, cut taxes, strengthen defense. We worked very hard at that.

We had to learn a lot. No member of the Republican majority in the House had ever served in the majority as a Republican, except the late Bill Emerson, who was here as a page, a sophomore or junior in high school, when the Republicans were last in charge. So we did not know a great deal about the complexities of our system.

□ 1400

We passed bills in the House. In fact, we met our commitment under the Contract With America, and we passed all the bills except one that was in the Contract within the first 93 days. But then they went to the Senate, and we learned the hard way that the other body can be more complex and more difficult. And then even when we worked out agreements with the Sen-

ate, we discovered that under the Constitution with the President's power of the veto, working things out between conservative Republicans and a liberal Democrat can be very complex.

One of the reasons I am so proud of the budget negotiations of the last few weeks is that I think we took into account that complex constitutional provision and we established an opportunity for us to continue to move in a direction we believe in, while recognizing the power of the President's veto pen and recognizing that on some issues the other body does not fully agree with us. This occurs, I think, in a backdrop of frankly pretty remarkable successes.

Probably the most powerful single items we campaigned on in 1994 were reforming welfare and balancing the budget. And the track record is clear. In the last Congress, we passed welfare reform three times. It was vetoed twice, and the third time it was signed into law.

Today, because of that Republican welfare reform bill signed by a Democratic President in a bipartisan effort, there are 3½ million fewer people on welfare, 3½ million more people in the private sector. That means we have been liberating poor people from being trapped in public housing, living on food stamps, and Aid to Families and Dependent Children. We have been giving them the kind of training, the kind of job opportunities, we have opened up for them the opportunity to go to live a better life with a better income, to have a chance to climb the ladder of opportunity.

But there was an important secondary effect which had been felt by every State government, most city governments, and now by the Federal Government. And that is when we take 3½ million people who have been living on welfare, drawing money from the government, and put them out into the private sector where they are paying taxes, we change the cash flow of the government very dramatically.

This has helped State after State. I noticed it in Montana. It had a 50 percent decline. There are counties in Oklahoma that have had a 70 percent decline in welfare rolls. In New York City, Mayor Rudy Giuliani has announced that his goal is to have no one on welfare after the year 2000. Every able-bodied adult will either be working or being trained to work, but no one will be sitting passively receiving welfare.

These are very dramatic changes. That was the number one change of the first 2 years that the Republicans were in charge of the Congress in this cycle.

But in that period, as powerful and as important as welfare reform was, it did not meet all of our goals. We were not strengthening defense. We were stopping the liberals from cutting defense, but we were not strengthening it. We were not cutting taxes. We had not balanced the budget.

So, we came back and last year, in a very difficult, very complex negotia-

tion with the President, at the end of July we reached a bipartisan agreement. And it was historic. Last year, we saved Medicare. We passed the entitlement reforms to balance the budget, and we cut taxes, including a cut in the capital gains tax to continue economic growth, giving us what will soon be the longest peacetime expansion in American history. Including a cut in the death tax as a step towards abolishing the death tax, because we do not believe it is right to punish parents and grandparents when they work and save all their lives by having them taxed when they die. Including a \$500 per child tax credit, which we had committed to in the Contract With America, because we believed, and do believe now, that it is important for parents to have the money in their take-home pay so that parents are in a position that they can spend the money on their children. And that is why we thought a \$500 per child tax credit was a good idea.

I happened to be with Governor Terry Branstad at one point when the septuplets were born, and we were talking about what it meant to have \$500 a year tax credit when a family has that many children, and how much they need the money and, as I went into, parents all over America who have two or three children who might be working at a job where that extra \$1,500 a year is a big deal. We are grateful and glad that we could pass and get signed into law the \$500 per child tax credit.

We also passed educational tax breaks last year, which the President proposed and we adopted together, and on a bipartisan basis we did some things that were good for education, particularly at the college and vocational-technical level.

Because we saved Medicare without raising the FICA tax, which would have killed jobs; because we reformed the entitlements and saved \$600 billion; because we were able to cut spending on the domestic discretionary side, and there I commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOB LIVINGSTON) for his hard work; because we were able to cut taxes to continue economic growth, the budget in the fiscal year that just ended, fiscal year 1998, is balanced for the first time since 1969.

Now that is a tremendous achievement. \$71 billion is the current projection. We will know the exact number in a couple more weeks when the Treasury reports. But the estimate now is that the budget was balanced not in 2002, when we promised we would balance it; not in 2005, which was the President's proposal; it is balanced in 1998, 4 years ahead of schedule.

And of the \$71 billion, every penny will be put aside, actually to pay down the debt as a step toward saving Social Security. Every penny, the largest surplus, I think, in American history. And the important thing is, it is being followed this year, and we are now in fiscal 1999, the fiscal years run from October to October, now in this fiscal year,

we will have another surplus. The current estimate is it will be at least \$60 billion on top of last year's \$71 billion.

In fact, because of our hard work over the last 4 years, because we reformed welfare, because we reformed the entitlements, because we cut domestic spending, because we cut taxes to increase economic growth, and because when we balance the budget we lower interest rates, because the Federal Government is the largest borrower, and when the Federal Government does not have to borrow, interest rates come down, the estimate is they come down by at least 2 full percentage points at the same stage of an economic cycle from where we are borrowing, here are the numbers that I think are truly historic:

This Congress, with Republican leadership working with a Democratic President, this Congress moved us from January 1995, when the projection was that we would borrow \$3.1 trillion over the next 11 years. The numbers are almost unimaginable. Let me repeat them. The projection when we took over, after the liberal Democrats had raised taxes and claimed it was deficit reduction, the projection was that our government would be borrowing \$3.1 trillion over the next 11 years.

That is \$3.1 trillion that our children and our grandchildren would spend all of their lives paying taxes to pay interest on that Federal debt. Instead today, because of the Republican reforms working with a Democratic President, because the Republican reforms worked, we are talking about a surplus of \$1.65 trillion. Let me repeat that number, because it is, again, big. A surplus of \$1.65 trillion.

That is why the House Republicans this year said we ought to consider a tax cut, because we believe it is very important to get that surplus back home so that Americans have it in their pocket. Because, frankly, the only reason we have a surplus is the American people go to work, pay their taxes, and send the money to Washington.

I was often asked, when it was announced that we had a balanced budget, and on September 30 and October 1, at the end of the fiscal year, there were a lot of people talking here in Washington and reporters would come up to me and say, "Well, President Clinton claims that he deserves credit for the balanced budget. What do you think?" And I think they thought we would get into a Republican-Democrat argument.

I said, "Wait a second. I think Republicans deserve 5 percent of the credit. I think the President deserves 5 percent of the credit. But I think 90 percent of the credit goes to working, taxpaying Americans who got up every day, went out and either created a job or went to a job. They paid their taxes. It is their money that created the surplus."

It was not the Republicans in Congress' taxes and it was not the President's taxes. We together do not pay enough to run this government for a

day or an hour. It was the country. Let us give the country some credit, which means it is the country's surplus.

We Republicans believe that there are two things that we should do with that surplus. We believe first that its highest priority is to save Social Security. And we believe we can create personal savings accounts for every person who pays the FICA tax so that they have money they control, that they will be able to have built up interest on a tax-free basis so over their working lifetime they have a base amount of money that is a part of the Social Security system.

We believe, second, every penny left over above that ought to go back to the American people as a tax cut. But we also believe that if we leave a trillion dollars sitting around Washington, D.C., liberals will figure out a way to spend it and we will have bigger government with more bureaucracies and we think that is wrong. We think that money belong to the American people, not to the Washington bureaucrats.

So, here we are today, having just put in the bank \$71 billion, with a projected \$60 billion to \$80 billion surplus this year and with the Federal Reserve yesterday lowering interest rates again, continuing the economic growth which continues the opportunity for us to do good things for Americans.

It was in that setting, having reformed welfare, cut taxes, balanced the budget, and saved Medicare that we went into this year's negotiations with the President. We had several very specific goals.

First, we wanted to begin to rebuild national defense. Second, we wanted to pass very strong anti-drug legislation. Third, we wanted to keep Internet pornography away from our children. Fourth, on education, we wanted to guarantee that spending decisions would be made at the local level.

These are very important steps. We also, frankly, were in a stalemate. The President refused to consider a tax cut and we refused to consider \$135 billion in increased taxes and fees that he had proposed. So, we blocked his tax increases, he blocked the Republican tax cuts, and that was sort of a stalemate.

We also knew that there were some practical problems. I had been traveling across the country. I knew that from Georgia to Louisiana to Texas, there were terrible weather conditions which had hurt family farms. I knew that in North Dakota and South Dakota and Montana there were unique problems. I knew that the drop in farm prices was causing American farmers a very great difficulty, because with the Asian economic problems we had lost a substantial number of markets that had been very important on to American farmers. So, we knew there had to be emergency help for farming.

All of us knew, from the tragic embassy bombings this summer, that there were problems with our embassies and that we had to spend some extra emergency money to protect our

embassies and that that was a matter of national pride. That if we had people out there serving America in embassies around the world, we owed it to them to strengthen the embassies against terrorist attack and terrorist bombing.

We also knew that we had a year 2000 problem that was very real in terms of computers and being able to solve that, and that it would be irresponsible, irresponsible for us to not provide the resources to solve the problem of the year 2000 in government computing so that aircraft could land safely, so that Social Security checks could go out, so that the IRS could work, the INS could work, and all of the other things that we have been working on, including the FBI, national defense and a whole range of key areas. So, we knew that would be an emergency.

So, as we entered this negotiation, we continued a process of commitment to reform which had been a part of the way we had been working for the last 4 years. And sometimes let me say these reforms take time. We established first a commission on the Internal Revenue Service. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) cochaired that commission. They reported a need to dramatically reform the Internal Revenue Service.

Then we had hearings by the Committee on Ways and Means on the need to reform the Internal Revenue Service, and the Senate Finance Committee did an outstanding job on hearings, listening to horror stories about what was wrong with the Internal Revenue Service.

Then we had a bill produced, working in a bipartisan basis with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), a Democrat who had spent years of his life dedicated to reforming the Internal Revenue Service. And, finally, we produced and passed by a large margin a Republican-led but bipartisan effort which the Democratic President signed. We proved, once again, that America could work, because we did change the Internal Revenue Service and we returned the burden of proof to the government and we protected individuals from government's intervention.

□ 1415

Those are the kind of reforms that we entered this budget negotiation continuing to work for. We had a specific proposal, called Dollars to the Classroom, a proposal which Senator SLADE GORTON had been working on in the Senate and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) had been working on over here.

It is a very simple idea. If we spend less money on bureaucracy in Washington, we can take that money and spend it in classrooms back home. Our model, the Republican model, was that local teachers, local parents, local students, in a local classroom, governed by a local school board, was the right place to solve education problems in America; that creating more Washington bureaucracies, with more effort in Washington, with more Washington red

tape, with more money spent in Washington, was not going to solve education, whether it was in Atlanta, Georgia, or Albany, New York, or Sacramento, California.

The trick was to get the money to the classroom. In fact, we passed in this House the initiative of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), which guaranteed 95 percent of the money would go to the classroom.

I must say, with the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and Senator SLADE GORTON, in the negotiations with the President over the last week, we did better than that. We took the President's proposal for new teachers, a proposal which was too narrow because it did not allow anyone to spend money on special education teachers; it was too Washington-based because it was going to have Washington red tape and a lot of the money was going to be eaten up in administration, and we changed it into a Dollars for the Classroom local support to hire teachers.

We changed it in a couple of very key ways. First of all, we said the local school board would make the decision, no new Federal bureaucracy, no new State bureaucracy, not a penny in the bill that was passed goes to pay for bureaucracy; all of it goes to the local school districts, the 14,000 school districts that make such a big difference in the United States.

Second, we said that the school district, the school board, could decide what kind of teachers they needed. They were not going to be trapped into the President's proposal of only first, second and third grade and only general teachers. If they needed special education teachers, they could get it. If they needed special aid teachers, they could get it. If they wanted to hire them for any grade level, they could choose.

So we had reestablished principles that we thought were very important. Yes, there will be teachers but they would be the teachers your community needed, picked by your school board and filling the kind of classes you think you need to solve your problems, and we included special education children and special education teachers in our proposal.

We thought it was a win-win. The President got to claim victory, but the fact is it is the American people who are better off and the children of America who are better off.

We insisted on the first increase in defense spending since 1985. For the last 13 years, we have been living off the Reagan buildup. President Reagan was committed to a strong American defense. We fought Desert Storm with President Reagan's military, and for years we have not had an increase; for years there has been a gradual decline in the amount that we have been investing in our military. Recently, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the head of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps and the Chairman of the

Joint Chiefs, met with the President and said things had now declined from the President Reagan model, they had declined so much under President Clinton and Vice President GORE, the military had gotten so weak that the Joint Chiefs could no longer certify that the American military could lead around the world without risking dramatic casualties.

We Republicans have a very simple belief. We believe if a young man or a young woman has the moral courage, the patriotism, to join the American military, if they are willing to put on the uniform of the United States, then we, the citizens, owe it to these young men and women, that they have the best equipment, the best training and sufficient numbers to win decisively and with minimum loss of American life. That is our principle.

So I am proud to report to the House that we have built into this budget agreement the first increase in defense spending since 1985. It is \$9.5 billion towards defense intelligence and anti-drug interdiction and it is a very important building block to establishing America's commitment to leading the world, defending our country and making sure that our men and women in uniform have the best equipment, the best resources and the best training.

We also had an absolute commitment to saving our children from drugs. Here I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) because they worked together leading a task force on the anti-drug effort. They worked with General Barry McCaffrey, the drug czar. We passed three very strong bills, a community-based antidrug effort, drug prevention, to make sure children know they should not be using drugs, and blocking drug dealers interdicting at the border, going after the drug czars down in places like Colombia and Peru.

Frankly, we had some arguments with the Clinton administration. We are much more committed to interdiction than the Clinton administration is, and it is a policy argument. I am not saying that they are in any way bad people. They would not approach this as aggressively as we would. They would not spend the kind of money on interdiction we would. They were not prepared to do some of the things that we thought was essential.

We held our ground, and we said we are going to pass strong antidrug legislation. We said we are going to be committed to actually funding the antidrug interdiction effort, and to his credit General Barry McCaffrey came up here, met with us and as a result we were able to write very strong antidrug legislation.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), who has worked on this for years, told me it is the most powerful antidrug legislation in congressional history. I think it is going to have a big impact. I think it was the right

thing to do, and I am proud that that is in this particular budget agreement.

We also had a totally different provision, one which Senator COATS of Indiana and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) had been working on, one which said the Internet is a wonderful tool but children should not be exposed to pornography on the Internet; one which said that today all too often your child, if they learn how to use that computer, can be having access to pornography in a way which is totally inappropriate and that you ought to have an ability to make sure that that is not happening.

It is a very strong bill. Let me be clear about this. The bill that we put in, the anti-Internet pornography bill, is a strong child protection bill and I want to be clear that we have no, none, no reservations. We are not in any way embarrassed to say to people, you are darn right, we want to save our children. We think it is wonderful that kids are learning to use computers. We think it is vital for their future that they learn to use computers but they ought to do so in an environment that is safe for children.

This bill is in this agreement and I think it is a very powerful step forward in the right direction.

I could go on and talk about a wide range of issues. There are things that we did that were right. There were things the President got. There is no question under our constitution, when there is a liberal democrat as president and a conservative Republican Congress, when there are negotiations, if they are going to be successful, each side is going to have to work out agreements. No one is going to win everything, but I think what we have done is we have passed a very responsible agreement.

That money, which is set aside for emergencies, I think is legitimate and defensible. I do not want to go back and say I am not prepared to protect our embassies from terrorists. I do not want to go back and say to my folks in Atlanta and in Marietta and in Alpharetta that I am not prepared to make sure that our government has what it needs to solve the Year 2000 problem. I am not prepared to go back home and say that the farmers I have talked to, the fields I have looked at, the weather problems that are real, the price problems caused by Asia that are real, that I am going to walk off and write off American family farms.

I am not prepared to go back home and say that I am going to let young men and women in uniform have inadequate aircraft without spare parts in too few numbers with inadequate training so we are going to risk their lives if they are put in harm's way to defend America. I will not do that. So I am prepared to defend the emergency part of this.

The nonemergency parts, and I want to commend the Clinton administration, they came in with offsets, they provided a way to stay under the

spending caps in the nonemergency parts. We sustained the budget agreement of last year. As I said, the surplus for this year, even with this bill, is going to be somewhere between \$60 billion and \$80 billion in surplus, not deficit, money that can be used to save Social Security and money that can be used for tax cuts.

We have a few tiny tax cuts, \$9 billion worth over the next 10 years, much too small. I wanted a lot more. This House passed \$80 billion in tax cuts measured over 5 years, about \$175 billion over 10 years. That was close to the right size, still not as big as I would have liked. The American people deserve to have the money back in their pockets. They are the ones who are working and paying the taxes. It is their surplus, but we did get an extension of the research and development tax credit, which is very important, because it represents a commitment that we Republicans are particularly proud of.

We believe in the Information Age it is important to invest in science. It is important to invest in research. We believe we are on the edge of tremendous breakthroughs in medicine. That is why this budget agreement includes tremendous increases in resources for the National Institutes of Health. Earlier we funded the National Science Foundation.

When you look at the potential breakthroughs that we are seeing in diabetes, that we are seeing in AIDS, that we are seeing in cancer, that we are seeing in heart disease, the work that we in this Congress have begun to push on Alzheimer's disease, the work we are doing on Parkinson's disease, the possibilities, for example, of dealing with prostate and breast cancer, I have a sister who is going to have her seventh anniversary as a breast cancer survivor on Halloween. I know when I talk to Robbie I know how it is important that we are doing the kind of research we are on breast cancer.

I lost both my father and my stepfather to lung cancer. My best friend I lost to pancreatic cancer when he was 49. I know how vital it is that we have the resources going into the National Institutes of Health, and I know for American business and job creation and the future of this country in the world market how vital it is that we also have money that is going through the R&D tax credit.

There is one other area that is very controversial that I want to mention because I want to be very up front about it. Yes, we have funding for the International Monetary Fund in this bill. Several of my good friends have said to me, I would like to vote yes when we have a chance on Tuesday but how do I go home and explain that?

I think there are two very profound explanations. First of all, when looking at the economic problems in Russia, looking at the economic problems in Indonesia, looking at concerns that have been expressed about Brazil, look-

ing at the concerns that are currently being expressed about Japan and Korea, I am not sure this is a very good time to take a big, gigantic gamble with the world economy.

I used to be a college teacher. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, used to be a professor of economics. He wrote textbooks on economics. He is a hard line conservative. It is one thing to be out in the classroom with a chalk board explaining theoretically what to do, but we now bear the responsibility, as the leadership of the House, and I am not prepared to take a river boat gamble and decide let us just eliminate the IMF funding and see how things work for the next year and, by the way, if the world economy crashes and we end up in the great depression, that will be an interesting experiment.

I think that is, frankly, irresponsible. We have to fund the IMF because we are the leader of the world. No one else can lead the world. No other country will invest in the IMF unless the U.S. does, and while I have big questions about the International Monetary Fund, while I think they are frankly not always following the right policies, it is clear that it would be a very, very large gamble to walk off, leave them without resources and then if there is a crisis not be able to deal with it.

On the other hand, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) said, and I believe in a historic intervention, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) began a year ago to say the American people deserve to know what the IMF is doing with their money. He said this organization is more secret than the Federal Reserve. He said we cannot come to the elected people who represent America and say to them we are going to invest \$18 billion in the IMF and not know what is being done with it, not know what decisions they are making, not hold them accountable. He was very clear. He said no accountability, no money.

We met with Secretary Rubin, and I want to frankly put in a word of praise for Secretary Bob Rubin. He had been a businessman. He had been a deal maker. He understood how you had to sit in a room and say, all right, if I am going to get A, you are going to get B.

We said to him flatly, you want 18 billion phony dollars, then give us phony reforms. You want 18 billion real dollars, we want real reforms. To his credit, he said I get it.

Secretary Rubin, I think, did a tremendous job of sitting down with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, working out real reforms, and let me say how real they are. The Secretary of the Treasury and the chairman of the Federal Reserve both have to submit a report to Congress that they have convinced all 7 nations, that are the leaders of the IMF, that all 7 have to be committed to the Armeys reforms.

□ 1430

All seven have to sign up that they are going to insist that the IMF adopt the Armeys reforms. What do the Armeys reforms say? They say first of all when the IMF makes a loan, the minutes of that decision, the documents relating to that decision in a timely manner have to be made public. We get to find out what is happening with the money, why is it being done, and hold them accountable for it. It says, second, when a loan is being made to a country that has had a bad series of economic decisions, that country has to pay above the market rate at which the IMF is getting its money, I think the minimum is 300 basis points, 3 percent above the market rate, which is a substantial penalty for bad behavior, so we begin to reestablish moral hazard, but you do not have some nice, easy, cheap money bank over here, "Go ahead and run your country in a bad way and you can always get the money from the internal bureaucrats." We start to establish a real standard of real involvement and real oversight. Any student of the International Monetary Fund will tell you that a year ago, it would have been impossible to have imposed these kind of genuine, deep, real reforms. I think that DICK ARMEY deserves a lot of credit because he stood up when a lot of people who thought they were sophisticated attacked it. Now, he was surrounded by people like former Secretary of State and Treasury George Shultz. He did have support from people like Nobel prize winner Milton Friedman. But I think it says a lot for Dr. ARMEY, an economist in his own right, that we got this done.

So I can go home and say to my most conservative constituents, I am prepared to help support the world economy, I am prepared to make sure that we have the resources collectively so we do not have an international collapse, but I am prepared to do it only with real guaranteed reforms that make the IMF accountable to the American people and that for the first time ever establishes a legislative oversight board so that all the democracies will have elected legislators reviewing the IMF for the first time in history and that is an important step in the right direction towards dealing with the emerging world market.

Let me summarize. Four years ago, we campaigned at exactly this time and said there is a Contract With America and we are serious, we will keep our words. We passed welfare reform and it is working. We passed a bill to save Medicare without raising the FICA tax, and it is working. We passed a bill to balance the budget, and the budget is now in its second year of being balanced. And not barely tiny balanced by some sleight of hand but \$71 billion last year, and \$60 to \$80 billion this year in surplus, something most Americans did not think they would hear in their lifetime, and we are setting the stage to come back in January and begin to save Social Security.

We have a budget agreement which we will vote on Tuesday which is the best agreement you could get when you have a conservative Republican Congress and a liberal Democratic President sit down side by side and negotiate, and I think it is an agreement which is good for the American people with local control of education, with special education children and teachers being helped, with our military being strengthened, with the International Monetary Fund being reformed, very serious steps with a strong war on drugs, and with Internet pornography being blocked from our children.

I yield to my good friend from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the Speaker for yielding. I was watching his remarks over the last several minutes. I want to thank him and all the others who worked for a strong national defense in this emergency supplemental. It is very, very critical. I would simply ask him to talk a little bit about the fact that the North Koreans now have an ICBM capability.

Mr. GINGRICH. The gentleman from California has been involved as a member of the Committee on National Security and chairman of a key subcommittee. Would he just share with the audience for a minute the kind of problems we are having with readiness and with equipment and personnel and with pilot retention, and why it is so vital that for the first time since 1985 we have begun to rebuild defense so that every pro-defense conservative will understand why they should vote "yes" next Tuesday for this agreement.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the Speaker for the opportunity to talk a little bit about what has happened to defense under this administration. We are going to be about 800 pilots short in the Air Force this year. We are already about 18,000 sailors short in manning the ships. When I talk about the ships, it is not 600 ships anymore, it is only about 330 ships in the United States Navy. We are about \$1.6 billion short in basic ammunition for the men and women of the United States Army. We are about \$193 million short of basic ammunition for the United States Marine Corps. Our aircraft, which have a certain mission capability rate, that means if you have 10 airplanes in the hangar or 10 airplanes on the carrier deck, how many of those planes will be able to fly out if they are called for a mission. Our aircraft mission capability rate has fallen from about 72 percent on the average, Navy, Marine and Air Force, to about 61 or 62 percent, a massive fall in what we call mission capability.

Mr. GINGRICH. I want to make sure that our audience and Members all understand what we have just said. Four out of every 10 aircraft, in a smaller Air Force, in a smaller Navy, 4 out of every 10 aircraft are not today mission capable at a 100 percent rate. We have fewer aircraft, fewer pilots. It is not like this was from the Reagan buildup.

We have been sliding now for a decade. And in the smaller system, 4 out of every 10 aircraft are not capable, completely capable of their missions.

Mr. HUNTER. The Speaker is exactly right. That means out of 10 aircraft that are on the line when you call for them to do their mission operation to carry out their mission, only about 60 percent, a little over 60 percent of those aircraft are capable of doing it, and that is after we have cut our air wings from 24 to 13 fighter air wings. So we have roughly half the air power that we had during Desert Storm. And even those aircraft, those reduced squadrons, are becoming very unready.

Mr. GINGRICH. I think it is really important to slow down so people lock in their head how bad the deterioration under Clinton and GORE has been of our military. We have about half as many aircraft in the Air Force and 60 percent of those are mission ready.

Mr. HUNTER. That is exactly right.

Mr. GINGRICH. So we probably have about 35 to 40 percent as many aircraft that are mission ready as we would have had at the peak of the Reagan buildup.

Mr. HUNTER. That is exactly right. Let me mention something else that I know struck the Speaker and JERRY SOLOMON, chairman of the Committee on Rules and many others who are concerned about national defense. We have been looking at accident rates. I have one member on my staff who just cares about the people that fly aircraft, and he gives me the weekly accident rate. That means helicopters and aircraft that have just crashed during the year. We now have had 43 of them crash, at least according to my estimates and my reports, this year. That is almost more aircraft than we are building but it also claimed about 70 lives. The Navy reports that they have more crashes this year per thousand flying hours than they had last year, roughly twice as many. Now, last year we had what was considered to be a very good year in the Navy in terms of a safety record. But they mentioned when they came over and briefed the defense committees in this body and the other body that this is something that they are very concerned about. So at a time when we are trying to get pilots to do two things, one we are trying to get our experienced pilots to stay in and they are not staying in. The rate of leaving the services for senior pilots who could stay in, who could opt to stay in in the Marines is now 92 percent. That means 92 percent of them are leaving. Only 8 percent are staying who are eligible. But the way to instill morale and to instill a desire to stay in the service is to show that you are buying the absolute best aircraft for these people and that you are giving them all the training hours that they need, which we are not now doing, and that you are giving them all the spare parts that they need that they are not now doing.

This brings me back to my point. The Speaker and his negotiators got 9 bil-

lion extra dollars for national security, for this vital national security function which is inadequate right now, which is being abandoned. I know you did that at great pain, and I realize the President is half this process. And the President got some of the things that he wants in this bill. I would simply say to every conservative and every Republican or Democrat or independent who believes in a strong national defense for America is that the money that you got to restore these readiness accounts, the money that you got to restore our program for a national missile defense which we still do not have, even as North Korea builds an ICBM, the money that you got for the other problems with the military far outweighs any concessions, in my estimation, that were made to the Clinton administration.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank my friend. Let me just close by building on what he just said. We came in with a contract with America in 1994. In 1995 and 1996 we passed balanced budget agreements which the President vetoed, we fought to balance the budget. We did get the President to sign welfare reform. In 1997 we became the first re-elected Republican Congress since 1928. At that time we insisted on saving Medicare, on balancing the budget and on cutting taxes. Those are the three great achievements of 1997. This year we began with reforms such as the Internal Revenue Service reform bill, which was a very important step in the right direction that we passed in June, that was signed into law. We began to work on ideas like dollars to the classroom to eliminate Federal bureaucracy and get the money back home to local schools and local teachers. Now we have a sound, solid, bipartisan budget agreement which frankly both sides agree to, which is good for America and which has a wide range of things.

Next year if we come back in the majority, we will save Social Security with a major bill using a large part of the surplus to save Social Security without cutting benefits or raising taxes, we will pass a very major tax cut, including, I hope, abolishing the death tax so that people no longer are punished if they work and save all their lives. We will also continue to strengthen defense, continue to work on winning the war on drugs, continue to reform education, and continue to move towards a more modern, more effective computer age government that costs less and provides better services and better defenses at less cost. I think all of this is possible. I think we can be very proud of this Congress. I think we can be very proud of this budget agreement. I hope on Tuesday we will have a resounding vote to make sure the American people know that we are working in a practical, commonsense way.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 109. An act to provide Federal housing assistance to Native Hawaiians.

## ON NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk with my colleague the chairman of the R&D subcommittee the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and talk a little bit to our colleagues and those that are listening about some of the background with respect to the defense requirements that we just talked about with the Speaker (Mr. GINGRICH). First, Mr. Speaker, let me talk about personnel shortages, because when we put together a defense budget, often the newspapers say the Pentagon got \$300 billion, or the Pentagon got \$250 billion or the Pentagon got this or got that. And the picture that they create is of just a big bureaucracy in Washington that takes up money, and that bureaucracy does not translate into real people who have real needs. Actually the Department of Defense is about 50 percent people. That means that not only the soldiers, the sailors, the airmen, the marines who serve this country, but also the many people who back them up. That means people who repair aircraft like those at North Island naval air rework depot in San Diego, California in my district or the people that repair the ships or the people that do the high-tech work or the teams that fly around the world as we project American military power to support a very complex military. Personnel is a very important part of our national defense. If you talk to folks like Commandant of the Marine Corps Chuck Krulak and others, you may come to the conclusion that actually they are the primary part of our national defense, they are the most important part, the good people, and they come from America's villages and towns and cities and farms and they serve in the American military often at great inconvenience and often at a pay scale that is much less than their civilian counterparts.

Let us talk about personnel shortages that we have today. The United States Air Force is going to be short almost 800 pilots, a little over 700 pilots for this fiscal year that is coming up. Now, when you train a pilot, you put

several million dollars minimum into his training, so we are losing not only those good people and all that experience but we are also losing the money that we put into their training.

□ 1445

We are going to be very short on pilots.

In the Navy we are going to be short 18,000 sailors and 1,400 recruits in this fiscal year. That means that when a guy comes back from a 3 or 4 or 5-month deployment, we have to send him out immediately to another deployment because there is nobody there to rotate with him, to fill his shoes and to give him a little family time.

Marine aviators have been traditionally our most loyal people with respect to re-upping, taking that next jump of 5 or 6 years or 4 years in the service and opting to do that instead of being in the private sector, and yet our Marine aviators are now leaving the service at a rate of 92 percent.

Even the Army, which has a limited air power but also has, obviously, a very large helicopter force attending its ground forces, is going to be 140 Apache pilots short in 1999. Now those Apache pilots you saw on CNN when they were doing such a great job on Saddam Hussein's tanks during Desert Storm. Those are the pilots that we will be lacking in this next year.

Now I talked a little bit about mission capable rates with the Speaker, and once again here are the mission capable rates, and this is a chart that shows how they are going downhill very quickly.

Mission capable is kind of like the Speaker described it. If you send out 10 aircraft or you have 10 aircraft on the line, how many of them can actually fly out and do their mission? Just like having four or five combines on your farm, and it is time to harvest the wheat, and the first thing you ask your foreman is how many of the combines are working. It may not be all the combines are working; maybe only half of them are working.

Well, we have gone from a mission capable rate that, for example, for the Air Force was 83.4 percent in 1991; that is when George Bush led us in Desert Storm; to today to about 74 percent. We have gone with the Marine Corps from 77 percent to about 61 percent, and with the Navy from 69 percent, almost 70 percent, to 61 percent. That means 6 out of 10 aircraft are able to actually get off the ground and perform their missions.

That is a good example of our declining readiness rates, and that means we have a lack of spare parts and we do not have enough components and enough people in some cases. That means mechanics and the people, the high-tech people that make these very complex weapons systems work, not enough people in the pipeline, not enough people on-station at that particular base to take care of those problems.

Let us go to equipment shortages.

We had almost a 600-ship Navy when Ronald Reagan left office. Today we are down to about 330 ships. We actually had about 546 ships in 1991. Today we are down to about 330. But we are losing a lot of those ships, we are retiring a lot of them. A lot of them are getting older, and, as you know, it takes a long time to build a ship. In fact, it was remarked the other day by one of our assistant secretaries for shipbuilding that actually when we started World War II, all the keels for the battleships had already been laid, meaning we had actually started to build these battleships knowing that there might be a problem. When FDR knew we would probably have a conflict with Adolf Hitler, he started a pretty good shipbuilding program in the late 1930's, and those ships got completed and got put to sea during World War II in the 1940s.

But the point is you have to start ships early. If you are going to field a ship in 1997, you need to start it in 1993 or 1994. Well, in this case we are building down to a 200-ship fleet by 2020. That means we are not replacing the ships in a 1-for-1 fashion. That means every time you retire three old ships, you only replace it with one young ship, one new ship. That means that we are going to have a 200-ship fleet by the year 2020 if we do not increase shipbuilding.

Ammunition shortages; we are \$1.7 billion short for the basic ammunition supply for the Army.

Now I would say that we have a couple of duties to the people that wear uniforms who still carry rifles in the field and still fire artillery and do those very things that are very, very difficult in this modern world where you have bio warfare, biological warfare, chemical warfare threatening them, surface-to-surface missiles threatening them. Well, one of the basic things you do for your soldiers and your marines is you give them enough ammo. We do not have enough ammunition for the so-called two regional contingency that we are supposed to plan for. That means if Saddam Hussein starts a fight in the Middle East, and North Korea takes advantage of that by coming down the peninsula, you have to have enough ammo to handle both those wars, both those contingencies.

We are short right now, we are short \$1.6 billion in basic ammunition.

Now that is not money for the Pentagon, that is money for people in the field who carry weapons in defense of this country who need to have ammo. There is nobody here who would send out a police force in a very difficult area without giving them ammunition for their guns, and yet we are preparing to do that with our people who wear the uniform in the Army and the Marine Corps.

Age and equipment; this is a pretty good example.

The CH-46 is kind of our workhorse helicopter in the U.S. Marine Corps. We



are trying to replace that. But the average CH-46, and if you look at the crashes that have taken place in the last 5 years, you are going to see a lot of these CH-46s there because a lot of them have crashed and taken the lives of the young Marines flying those airplanes and attending those airplanes as crewmen. But the average age of that CH-46 right here, about 40 years old.

We owe those people new equipment. They have a tough enough job as it is.

The assault vehicle; that is the amphibious vehicle that comes out. If you watched Saving Private Ryan, that is a vehicle that comes out, hits a beach and makes the assault from there; that is called an AAV. The average age of those vehicles is 26 years, so they are getting old, and we need to replace them with a new assault vehicle. We do not have money for it because this budget has been handed down to us by the so-called budget deal pressed by the Clinton administration to cut defense.

Now my Republican colleagues have added \$21 billion to the defense budget over the last 5 years, and I am very proud of that, and, as the chairman of the Military Procurement Subcommittee, I am really proud of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) who is our chairman of the full Committee on National Security, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) who is chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, because they tried to swim against a tide that was being handed down to them by the White House, and we put \$21 billion extra to try to meet some of these shortages.

But even after we put that in, the services finally came forth the other day, and they gave us a list of what they are short. They are \$80 billion short in what they call unfunded requirements. That means ships that we planned to build that we cannot afford to build, it means ammunition we cannot afford to buy. That means flying hours for our pilots, and we cannot afford to send them up because it is too expensive to fly the planes for those hours. That means spare parts and a lot of other things.

Well, the Speaker, when he put together this, our side's position on the negotiation on this emergency supplemental spending plan that we just made the deal with President Clinton on, argued for a strong national defense, and he said I have got to have extra dollars for defense. He said we have got to have extra dollars for intelligence.

We put \$2 billion into intelligence. That is so that when somebody is planning to blow up an American embassy, we have a network of people who are in key critical places in that particular country, wherever it might be, who have their ear to the ground with the terrorist networks. It was some of the state sponsored terrorist organizations, and they find out about the plan, for example, to blow up an embassy or to do something else in a terrorist fashion, and they relay it back to our peo-

ple here, and we are able to take action to keep it from ever happening in the first place. We need a strong intelligence force more than ever.

You know, the Soviet Union was big and it was strong, but it was very predictable in the so-called Cold War. We could see a lot of what they did, they moved in a very traditional fashion, and we knew where to go to get information.

Today we live in a world in which the CIA Director, Jim Woolsey, once said is full of poison snakes, although we have killed the big dragon of the so-called Soviet Union, and that is very true. There is a lot of small organizations that are terrorist organizations that want to kill Americans, and we need to have a good intelligence operation to cut them off at the pass. That means to find out what is going to happen before it happens and stop it. And to those ends, after a lot of behind-closed-doors briefings about the world situation, the Speaker fought for 2 billion extra dollars in intelligence funding.

We also fought hard for missile defense, and let me tell you what the problem is with missile defense.

The North Koreans have just launched a missile, went out over the Sea of Japan which surprised us. It surprised us just like the two nuclear blasts in India and Pakistan that our intelligence people did not know about, did not predict. We thought that the North Koreans would not achieve this ICBM capability for about 10 years. We thought that would not happen. But actually they have achieved it now. The missile that they launched, which is a so-called Taepo DONG I missile with three stages is capable of hitting parts of the United States. Now, if you couple that with the ongoing program that the Koreans, the North Koreans have followed, sometimes with greater exposure to us than other times, but nonetheless they have historically followed of trying to achieve nuclear capability and biological and chemical capability; that means the ability to throw a biological warhead with nerve gas in it, for example, that will kill civilians on contact; that program, married up with their missile program, will give them very soon the capability to reach some of the United States with missiles.

Now the problem with that is we have a military that is designed to stop tanks, it is designed to stop ships, it is designed to stop planes, it is designed to stop infantry. We have nothing, nothing that will stop an intercontinental ballistic missile from hitting a city in the United States, and that is a question I ask President Clinton's Secretary of Defense every time he appears before us: Could we stop a single incoming ballistic missile. And he always has to tell myself and other members of the National Security Committee, no, not one.

So we have to build a defense against incoming ballistic missiles. We live in the age of missiles. We have to understand that, we have to acknowledge it,

and we have to prepare for it. We do not at this point have a missile defense, but we need to have one, and the Speaker put almost a billion dollars into missile defense and got the Clinton administration to agree with it. That alone, with a lot of the things in this bill that I do not agree with that the Clinton administration pressed for, the President's agenda, the fact that he gave us that extra billion dollars for missile defense, that we got that, that alone is a compelling reason to vote for this emergency supplemental, because having a missile defense, of all the things in this package, is probably the one that I would deem the greatest emergency.

I want to close by going back to what we call the growing pay gap because this may tell you a little bit about what I started with. What I started to talk about, of course, was personnel, people. Why are they leaving the military after we put 1, 2, 3 or \$4 million into training a young man or a young woman to be a pilot? Why are they getting out? Why are our sailors leaving? Well, I will tell you why.

Since 1982, and I can remember being a Republican freshman in 1982, one of the first things that Ronald Reagan did was put in two bills that brought up our military to where they were level, they were even, with civilian pay, and that gave great morale to the people that were already in and it also gave a great incentive to young people that thought about joining to come into the military. Since then, and that is 1982 on this chart, you can see this big pink area which is now the difference between military people and civilians in the same type of work. So that means if you have got an electronics technician on the inside of the military, he is working in the military, and he looks outside and sees his friend who has the same schooling, same capability, that young person is making 13½ percent more than he is on the average. And so when you ask a young person to come into the military, and they look at that job level and the job description inside the uniformed services and the job description on the outside of the uniformed services, they come to the conclusion that it is best to stay on the outside, and that is what has been happening.

So we need to address this pay gap between the civilian sector and the uniformed sector, and we are going to be doing that.

□ 1500

Now, there are a couple of other things in the defense bill that are in the emergency supplemental before us, this big omnibus bill, that are defense-related.

We have the Y2K problem. We devoted some money to the Y2K problem. We have to solve that, because a lot of military activities are related to computers and could be badly damaged if we have a Y2K problem. That is this idea that in the Year 2000 many of the

computers are not predictable with respect to what they are going to do. So we are going to solve that Y2K problem. We have to do that in national security, as well as in the domestic area.

Also some of this money is devoted to paying for Bosnia. Let me tell you, that tells us where some of the money went that should have gone to pay, some of the money that should have gone to equipment, some of the money that should have gone to spare parts and training, and some of the money that should have gone to personnel retention bonuses. That money instead went, among other places, to Bosnia. So now we are paying for the money for the President's Bosnia operation, without taking it out of ammunition, without taking it out of training, without taking it out of readiness.

What we did in the old days, the President just said you military folks go look at your other areas, like training and people and ammunition, and pull some money out of those accounts, and we will use that money to go to Bosnia on. That is called taking it out of hide.

Well, we stopped that in this emergency supplemental, so even that money going to Bosnia does not directly help us with respect to modernization or pay rates or spare parts. At least it takes the pressure off the defense budget so we can buy ammunition, so we can pay our personnel more and give them some retention bonuses and we can buy those spare parts.

We spent about \$1 billion in this emergency supplemental on readiness. Most of that is going to go to parts. That means if you are working on a carrier and you need a certain part now for an aircraft, and a week later you may need another part, instead of having to fly that in with an airplane from some parts depot in the United States to halfway around the world, hopefully we will be able to buy enough of those spare parts so you have a couple of them on the shelf in the plane or on the ship, or, for example, have some of those components for the air crew that works that particular plane. So that will solve some of our readiness problems. So we have devoted over \$1 billion to that so-called readiness account in this emergency supplemental.

Let me just make the case again that there was a lot of negotiation that took place in this bill, but the important national security problems that the Speaker and his negotiating team took care of far outweigh any concessions that we might have had to make to big government and to the President.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OBEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKAGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIAHRT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2476. An act for the relief of Wei Jingsheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2431. An act to express United States foreign policy with respect to, and to strengthen United States advocacy on behalf of, individuals persecuted in foreign countries on account of religion; to authorize United States actions in response to violations of religious freedom in foreign countries; to establish an Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom within the Department of State, a Commission on International Religious Freedom, and a Special Adviser on International Religious Freedom within the National Security Council; and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1892. An act to provide that a person closely related to a judge of a court exercising judicial power under article III of the United States Constitution (other than the Supreme Court) may not be appointed as a judge of the same court, and for other purposes.

S. 1976. An act to increase public awareness of the plight of victims of crime with developmental disabilities, to collect data to measure the magnitude of the problem, and to develop strategies to address the safety and justice needs of victims of crime with developmental disabilities.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday October 19, 1998, at 12 noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

11677. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's "Report On Alternative System for Availability of Funds"; to the Committee on National Security.

11678. A letter from the AMD-Performance Evaluation & Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Part 95 of the Commission's Rules to Provide Regulatory Flexibility in the 218-219 MHz Service [WT Docket No. 98-169 RM-8951] Amendment of Part 95 of the Commission's Rules to Allow Interactive Video and Data Service Licensees to Provide Mobile Services [WT Docket No. 95-47 RM-8467], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

11679. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter providing information concerning the transfer of defense articles; to the Committee on International Relations.

11680. A letter from the Interim Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Audit of the Financial Accounts and Operations of ANC 5B for Fiscal Years 1991 through 1997," pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

11681. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to Establish an Additional Manatee Sanctuary in Kings Bay, Crystal River, Florida (RIN: 1018-AE47) received October 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

11682. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Body Armor Penalty Enhancement Act of 1998" received October 15, 1998; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

11683. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous [Revenue Procedure 98-54] received October 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 604. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 1132) to modify the boundaries of the Bandelier National Monument to include the lands within the headwaters of the Upper Alamo Watershed which drain into the Monument and which are not currently within the jurisdiction of a Federal land management agency, to authorize purchase or donation of those lands, and for other purposes, and for consideration of the bill (S. 2133) an act to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance (Rept. 105-823). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Committee on Resources. Monumental Abuse: The Clinton Administration's Campaign of Misinformation

in the Establishment of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument (Rept. 105-824). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

H.R. 4377. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than October 20, 1998.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. MURTHA):

H.R. 4847. A bill to authorize the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself and Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD):

H.R. 4848. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to allow any consumer to receive a free credit report annually from any consumer reporting agency; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish therapeutic equivalence requirements for generic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SKAGGS:

H.R. 4850. A bill to designate as wilderness certain lands within Rocky Mountain National Park, in Colorado; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

H.J. Res. 136. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1965. Referral to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than October 20, 1998.

H.R. 2748. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than October 20, 1998.

H.R. 3511. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than October 20, 1998.

H.R. 3828. Referral to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than October 20, 1998.

H.R. 3829. Referral to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, the Judiciary, and National Security extended for a period ending not later than October 20, 1998.

H.R. 3844. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than October 20, 1998.

H.R. 4023. Referral to the Committees on Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than October 20, 1998.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 121: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 590: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 902: Mr. THUNE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1401: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2537: Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 2817: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 3779: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 3940: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 3946: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3956: Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 4036: Mr. BENTSEN and Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 4552: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 4692: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 4818: Mr. CLYBURN and Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 4841: Mr. BLUNT.

H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H. Con. Res. 274: Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Con. Res. 347: Mr. PORTER, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Res. 512: Mr. LUTHER.